Serial No. 09/913,686

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herein to explicitly recite that in the step of encrypting, the audio data, video data, a combination of audio data and video data, text data or binary data forming an executive program <u>of the first section</u> are used for encrypting. Furthermore, claim 1 is also amended to recite in the processing step that the audio data, video data, a combination of audio data and video data, text data or binary data forming an executive program <u>of the unencrypted second section</u> are used in the processing step. These amendments are supported in specification, for example at page 7, lines 27-28 and page 8, lines 1-5.

Although Applicant has always intended to have this feature recited by the claim, the Examiner apparently believes that the earlier claim language was so broad that an encrypted second section used in the step of processing included any other data apart from audio data, video data, a combination of audio data and video data, text data or binary data forming an executive program. Although Applicant does not agree, Applicant believes that the current amendment clarifies the issue such that the Examiner's interpretation of the claim language cannot be maintained anymore.

Applicant respectfully posits that this amendment merely clarifies the claim language, and does not raise any new issue or makes a further search necessary.

Concerning the Final Office Action, on page 2, lines 14 to 17, the Examiner has argued that the X-fields of document VAN OORSCHOT corresponds to the unencrypted second section. As stated in column 6, line 47 of VAN OORSCHOT, these X-fields include a 512-bit RSA public key of entity A itself and the second field is the RSA-encryption of K' under this 512-bit key.

10

Serial No. 09/913,686

In view of the amended claim 1, it is clear that the processing step of the pending claim indeed processes audio data, video data, a combination of audio data and video data, text data or binary data forming an executable program of the unencrypted second section of said payload data, while, in VAN OORSCHOT, an RSA public key and an RSA-encryption of a symmetric key K' are processed by the hash function.

Thus, the Examiner argument that applicant's distinctions over the prior art are not supported by the claim language can no longer be maintained. In view of the amended claim language, the Examiner's rejection of Applicant's argument on page 3, lines 18 to 21 is also not valid anymore. The same is true for the Examiner's statements on page 4, lines 1 to 8. Furthermore, the Examiner's rejection of Applicant's argument on page 4, lines 16 and 18 is also not valid anymore.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Brill
Reg. No. 51,198

Customer No. 22,862

11